

## **Remarks**

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-16, 18, 20 and 23-26 are pending. Claims 4, 14, 17, 19 and 21-22 are canceled and new Claims 23-26 are added in this Response.

## **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 4, 6-10, 14, 17, 19 and 22 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form incorporating all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Rather than rewrite the allowable dependent claims, the base claims have been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter, as follows.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable Claim 4. Accordingly, Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claims 2-3 and Claims 6-10, as amended, depend from Claim 1. Claims 1-10 are, therefore, in condition for allowance.

Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable Claim 14. Accordingly, Claim 14 has been cancelled. Claims 12-13 depend from Claim 11 (directly or through an intervening claim). Claims 11-13 are, therefore, in condition for allowance.

Claim 18 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable Claim 19. Accordingly, Claim 19 has been cancelled. Claim 18 is, therefore, in condition for allowance.

Claim 20 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable Claim 22 (and intervening dependent Claim 21). Accordingly, Claims 21-22 have been cancelled. Claim 20, therefore, is in condition for allowance.


## **New Claims 23-26**

New Claims 23 and 25 recite a biasing mechanism and a damper that is discrete from the biasing mechanism. To the extent biasing springs 64 and 4 in McAllister (5901916) and Shima (6452748), respectively, might be deemed dampers, as asserted by the Office, they cannot be deemed both a biasing mechanism and a damper that is discrete from the biasing mechanism. For at least this reason, new Claims 23 and 25, therefore, distinguish over the cited references.

New Claims 24 and 26 which depend from Claims 23 and 25, recite that the damper comprises a resilient pad to further distinguish McAllister and Shima.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding office action.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Steven R. Ormiston  
Registration No. 35,974  
(208) 433-1991 x204